	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summ	09/4	63,209	BERGHOF ET AL.	
	Exa	miner	Art Unit	
	Julie	et C. Switzer	1634	
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>amended</u>				
(1) Juliet C. Switzer.	(			
(2) <u>Michelle Iwamoto</u> .	. (	(4)		
Date of Interview: 18 January 2005	Tii	me: morning		
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	] Applicant's r	epresentative)		·
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed: 82-94				
Prior art documents discussed:				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING TH See Continuation Sheet	E GENERAL N	NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:	
Part III.	·			
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a s directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a s did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief</li> </ul>	ation. The exame eparate record	miner will provide a writt	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	Applicant/Appl	cant's Representative S	ignature – if appr	opriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested amendments to place the claims in condition for allowance. The examiner suggested amending claim 82 to require "said nucleic acid molecule consists of at least 15 successive nucleotides of SEQ ID NO: 1, wherein said nucleic acid molecule comprises nucleotides 64-73 of SEQ ID NO: 1, 110-121 of SEQ ID NO: 1, or 127-156 of SEQ ID NO: 1, or the sequence complementary to said nucleic acid molecule." The amendment for claim 82 has basis at least on pages 14-15, especially where p. 15 discusses these regions of SEQ ID NO: 1 as being highly conserved in S. aureus relative to other Staphylococcus species. This amendment would overcome a 102 rejection based on Brennan who teaches all possible 10mer oligonucleotides on a microarray. Further, the examiner suggested canceling claim 84 and amending claim 94 to change "having" to "consisting of." Michelle Iwamoto, in a return phone call on 21 January 2005 indicated that applicant did not approve the amendments to the claims. It was agreed that a final office action would be mailed.